

## University of Dayton eCommons

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

4-11-2008

# 2008-04-11 Minutes of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_mins](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate, "2008-04-11 Minutes of the Academic Senate" (2008). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 5.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate\\_mins/5](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_mins/5)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact [frice1@udayton.edu](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu).

[Approved April 25, 2008]

## MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

April 11, 2008

302

Senators Present: P. Benson, D. Biers (presiding), L. Cook, R. Crum, D. Darrow, G. DeMarco, G. Doyle, C. Duncan, T. Eggemeier, A. Fist, R. Frasca, E. Gustafson, P. Johnson, R. Kearns, J. King, L. Kloppenberg, R. Larson, T. Lasley, L. Laubach, R. Marek, M. Moss, J. O'Gorman, D. Poe, Y. Raffoul, J. Saliba, D. Sink, L. Snyder, R. Wells

Senators Excused: C. Bowman, A. Brian, , A. Jipson, C. Letevac, M. Patterson, R. Penno, F. Pestello, A. Seielstad, T. Stevens, T. Sutter,

Guests: S. Wilhoit

1. Opening Prayer: Senator Poe opened the meeting with prayer.

2. Roll Call: Twenty-eight of thirty-nine Senators were present.

3. Minutes: February 8, 2008: Moved and seconded, minutes were approved.

4. Announcements: The April 25 meeting of the Academic Senate will be the final meeting for this academic year. Immediately following that meeting the Academic Senate for 2008-09 will convene to elect officers. Members of the Academic Senate for 2008-09 should submit forms for standing committee preferences. The Executive Committee makes these appointments and will have them for the April 25 meeting of the new Senate so that standing committees can meet to elect a chairperson.

5. Doc 06-11 Review of Tenured Faculty:

Senator Doyle briefly introduced the document and turned the discussion over to Senator Wells, who has had a major role in the development and writing of this document. She explained that this document is a statement of the underlying philosophy related to review of tenured faculty and a request for the Provost to appoint a faculty member to conduct an audit of current practices related to promotion, sabbatical, and annual reviews. The Faculty Affairs Committee believes that there is already a great deal of peer review taking place and that this can form the core of any post tenure review process. Once this audit is completed, the Faculty Affairs Committee will be in a better position to determine what additional policy or procedures may be needed in respect to post-tenure review.

Discussion of the document included the following points:

- Promotion and sabbatical are not required after tenure, so there may be a few faculty who do not fall under the current policies in those areas. It was noted that the Faculty Affairs Committee is aware of this and the audit should help determine the extent to which such cases exist.
- The Provost might appoint several faculty to work together on the audit rather than just one person.

The question was called. The vote was unanimous in favor of the document.

6. Doc 06-08: Evaluating Faculty Teaching for the Purpose of Tenure:

Senator Doyle introduced the document. He noted that has had a fundamental role in the original writing of this document and has worked with the Faculty Affairs Committee in the revision process. He also noted that the Faculty Affairs Committee is bringing this document forward only for tenure review. All other reviews have been removed from this document. He reviewed the document and reported that the Faculty Affairs Committee is asking that if the document is approved, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee should be charged with determining the date of implementation of the document.

Discussion of the document included the following points:

- Faculty-provided evidence of student achievement of learning objectives may not provide information about what an individual faculty member has really accomplished. Students may learn from other faculty and apply this to a course not taught by that faculty member. Faculty may self-select what they present as satisfying this goal.
- If faculty cannot provide such evidence, this will identify problems.
- The policy is for both summative and formative purposes. Providing such evidence may support the formative purposes.
- Implementation should consider where all the units are. Fall 2009 may be too soon for some units, especially the .
- Even if this is used for formative purposes, it will be used to make final decisions. Recognition of learning often takes place years after a course.
- This policy would really advantage faculty members. They provide the evidence and decide how to represent student learning.
- Student evaluations also ask for student perceptions of whether or not they believe they have learned. This information could be used to support learning outcomes.
- Departments determine learning outcomes for many courses. Faculty evaluating others bring this knowledge to the evaluation process.
- If this is approved, where does it go? The answer is that it goes to the units for implementation in their respective policies and to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee to determine when it will be implemented.
- It was noted that the Student Academic Policies committee will be looking at the course evaluation form next year.

Moved by Senator Darrow and Seconded by Senator Crum: III. B. 6 be struck from the document and II. B. 5 read “At least one self-evaluation produced by the faculty member. Faculty may also provide evidence of student achievement of learning.” Motion defeated with 4 in favor, 24 opposed.

Several friendly amendments were introduced by Senator Duncan. He asked that the second sentence of IV. B. 3 be deleted. It was agreed that this might add confusion to the policy and deleting it did not change the policy. He asked that in both IV. B. 4, and 8., the final sentence read “Each department should develop a consistent process for disseminating the results of the review with the individual faculty member.”

The question was called with the friendly amendments. The vote was 23 yes, 2 no, and 3 abstentions.

7. Reports of the Standing Committees:

●Senator Doyle reported for the Faculty Affairs Committee. They are working on a review of the Maternity Leave Policy. Lisa Rismiller, director of the Women's Center, is helping to develop a survey that will gather data related to the policy and its implementation. This survey should be out in the next week or two.

●Senator Darrow reported for the Academic Policies Committee. The sub-committee working on curriculum continues to report to them. They will bring some tentative proposals to the May 6 Humanities Base Workshop and Cluster Workshop. They are also reviewing the Honors/Scholars proposal and have provided the office with a list of recommendations. Revised aspects of the document will begin to be considered at the next meeting.

●Senator Fist reported for the Student Academic Policies Committee. They hope to have the Honor Code Policy ready for the April 25 meeting of the Academic Senate.

●Senator Biers reported for the Executive Committee. The Committee will finalize the agenda for April 25. The Committee approved two programs, the B.A. Major in Sociology for the UD India Program and the BA in Visual Arts. Both will go to the Board of Trustees. The Committee is also working on the Academic Senate's role in diversity issues, the structure of and information provided to the University community on the various committees, and a proposal from the Department of English to change the general education and competency requirements related to English composition. This proposal is working its way to the Academic Senate which has authority on such issues.

8. Adjournment: Moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 4:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia A. Johnson